

WISCONSIN WORKS (W-2) CONTRACT AND IMPLEMENTATION COMMITTEE

201 E. Washington Avenue, GEF 1, Room 224
Madison, WI 53707

Friday June 16, 2000

10:00 AM - 2:00 PM

MINUTES

The W-2 Contract and Implementation Committee is the single point of contact for feedback to the Department of Workforce Development on policy implementation related to W-2 agencies, and includes representation from the Wisconsin County Human Service Association (WCHSA), Urban Caucus counties, W-2 private agencies in Milwaukee County and the balance of state, and Tribal W-2 agencies.

COMMITTEE:

Members (Present = X)

X Jennifer Noyes DES/AO
William B. Adams Racine County
Jon Angeli Southwest Consortium
X Phyllis A. Bermingham Marathon County
William Clay OIC
X Mary Ann Cook Dane County
Tina Koehn UMOs
Kim Mooney Fond du Lac County
James Nitz Kaiser Group
Laverne Plucinski Bad River Chippewa
X Shirley Ross La Crosse County
X Jerry Stepaniak MAXIMUS
Julia Taylor YW Works
X Michael Van Dyke Door County
Glynis Underwood ESI
Judith A. Weseman Kenosha County

Alternates (Present = X)

Jan Alft Marathon County
Linda Brandenburg ESI
X Cheryl Cobb UMOs
Rosa Dominquez OIC
Mona Garland OIC
X Deb Hughes Southwest Consortium
Edward Kamin III Kenosha County
Richard L. Kammerud Polk County
X James Krivsky Racine County
X Barbara Metoxen Oneida Nation
Tom Miller La Crosse County
X Teresa Pierce Western WI PIC
Rita Renner YW Works
Sara Shackleton Dane County
Chris Schmitz Fond du Lac County

State Staff

Attendees:

Jude Morse, BDS
Lynn Schmitt, BWSP
Joseph Stafford, BFS
Jo Kutzner, BFS
Barbara Harris, BFS
Ginevra Ewers, BDS

Jan Van Vleck, DES/Acting Deputy Administrator
Alice Wilkins, BWSP
Dianne Reynolds, BWSP/WPS
Paul Saeman, DES
Ceri Jenkins, BWSP/WPS

Guests:

Kim Pomeroy, Clark County DSS
Kay Krenzke, ESI
Doris Green, OIC-GM
Janet Blair, ESI
Sharon K. McCormack, Sheboygan W-2
Joan Mulney, Marquette CDHS
John Wilberding, MAXIMUS

Tim Cowan, YW Works
Marilyn Putz, Walworth Co., Kaiser Group
Chris Schmitz, Fond du Lac CDSS
Ramona Martinez, UMOs
Jane Batha, Curtis & Associates, Waukesha Co.
Jennie Johnson, Marquette CDHS
Kathryn Ryan, Dodge CDHS

Recorder:

Stephen Dow, W-2 Contract and Implementation Committee Coordinator

Minutes Approval

Members felt there was insufficient time to review the draft minutes from the May meeting and asked that they be sent before the July meeting for review. Discussion on the draft May and June minutes will be done at the July meeting.

Issue/Discussion: Best Practices Discussion – Performance Standards Workgroup Update

John Wilberding, MAXIMUS, provided an update of the group's activities and discussed the draft workgroup report. Members asked for clarification of several points and Mr. Wilberding described some of the discussions the workgroup had in working out this draft.

Members decided to reserve further discussion on the paper until the July meeting so they would have further time to review and share the document's material.

Deb Hughes commented that some agencies did a pre-W-2 conversion of cases; those agencies may now be left with a larger number of cases with severe barriers. Ms. Cook agreed and felt that several agencies may already be at the place Milwaukee agencies appearing to be entering, with high numbers of severely barred cases.

Lynn Schmitt will review the subcommittee's draft report and prepare comments for the next meeting.

Issue/Discussion: Follow-up re Performance Standards from May Meeting (Paul Saeman)

Paul Saeman handed out several documents as aids in explaining some of the decisions made in establishing the performance standards and measurements.

Mr. Wilberding initiated a discussion about the impact on the W-2 agency when a case transfers from one to another. Lynn Schmitt and Paul Saeman replied that the negative impact only occurs when the case is added to the recipient agency's counts and the case remains W-2 and FSET.

Jim Krivsky mentioned that their FSET recipients seemed to have more immediate job skills to provide employers; John Wilberding says Milwaukee tends to find just the opposite---that more of the FSET recipients are transient and with more barriers.

Mr. Van Dyke asked that there be further discussion at the July meeting on the documents Paul provided; there is a lot of material in them and members need an opportunity to study them to make a discussing them useful.

Mary Ann Cook asked what the trends are in the FSET population. Mr. Saeman said he would discuss this next time.

Issue/Discussion: Performance Monitoring: Data Central Plans (Lynn Schmitt)

The Data Central group was to have met before this C&I meeting, but there meeting conflicted with the dates of the WSSA Conference. This item will be placed on the July agenda.

Lynn mentioned that the Monitoring Unit is now fully staffed and will be able to provide more evaluation help to agencies. The Unit is beginning to look at added data for CSJs. Teresa Pierce asked the difference between Lynn's unit and the Bureau of Field Services (BFS). Lynn said BFS does the sample and consultation; Lynn's staff provide more complete data. Communications will remain through the BFS regional office staff.

Ms. Schmitt also mentioned several problems have been encountered recently in using EOS. Members concurred that they've experienced the same. DWD and DOA systems staff are working on resolutions.

Issue/Discussion: Update on FEP Turnover Issue

Stephen Dow gave an update. The BFS Training Unit is active in a survey for data to provide the Committee. An update on its progress will be given in the July meeting.

Members had these questions/observations to be passed on to the Training Unit:

- Is the FEP structure part of the problem? Local agencies may have some insight into cause/effect on this and some exit interview material that would be helpful.
- What is the ratio of new worker v. ongoing? Is there an impact on expense?

Issue/Discussion: Welfare-to-Work (WtW) (Ceri Jenkins)

Ceri Jenkins described WtW efforts for those persons aging out of the foster care program. The status of those persons will be verified by contacts with the local foster care personnel.

Ms. Cook asked where the participants would be referred; Ms. Jenkins replied that they would be referred to other formula programs.

Mr. Van Dyke said most individuals aging out of the foster care programs do not wish any further contact with the agency and in fact, aggressively avoid such contact---they wish to be on their own. Ms. Jenkins said that, during recent roundtables on WtW, agencies were found to have encountered these youth and have found ways to maintain working contacts. Ms. Cook supported Mr. Van Dyke's comments but also mentioned that better foster parents seem to bring the youth to the agency as part of the aging out planning and that supports further working contacts. Child Welfare staff need to be closely involved in the WtW referral.

Deb Hughes asked if Independent Living Skills funds could be used as a match. Mr. Van Dyke responded that they could not as those are federal dollars and, as such, can't be used to match against other federal funds.

Jim Krivsky asked whether a person, aged 24, who was in foster care earlier could now participate in WtW? Ms. Jenkins responded that the person could. Cheryl Cobb asked how this situation could be verified; Ms. Jenkins said a verification policy/process was being worked on. Mr. Van Dyke suggested county child welfare staff would be able to provide supportive information.

Mr. Wilberding asked if confidentiality was an issue; Ms. Jenkins said it was and that participants would have to sign a release of information.

Phyllis Bermingham asked how many agencies were participating; Ms. Jenkins will research. Ms. Bermingham asked whether an agency that turned back WtW funds has a recourse; Jan Van Vleck said DWD still has the money and it may be possible to give it back to the local agency. Ms. Cobb remarked that the match would be a major issue; other members felt W-2 unrestricted profit might be used for this match.

Issue/Discussion: Overview of Income Maintenance Allocations History (Ginevra Ewers, DES/BDS)

Ginevra Ewers gave a Power Point presentation showing the history of the Income Maintenance allocations, showing its source and changes over the years.

Ms. Cook remarked that child care cases are not included in the charts but are frequently just as much workload and time consumption issues as were AFDC cases in the past.

Ms. Pierce asked how the definition of W-2 and IM cases will affect future negotiations. Ms. Ewers responded that discussions are going on about what cases are what types and, therefore, belong to which agency/contract. As the issue involves more than just the office number, identification of the cases by IM/WW type is difficult. Progress is being made, though. Ms. Noyes remarked that we need a better base for our discussion to get common understandings; this issue will be brought back to the committee when more research is completed.

Ms. Cook mentioned that we need to work some of this out with the IM agencies, as well. Part of that discussion must include the flexibility in using W-2 to cover IM shortfalls and vice versa. Jude Morse said she is working with Paul Saeman to research that issue.

Mr. Krivsky asked about the role of DHFS on our MA activities and contract. Ms. Noyes described some of the actual and proposed changes and will share more as it is possible. DHFS will be cosigners on the IM contract for MA purposes.

Ms. Bermingham commented that the recent Administrator's Memo on IM allocations was good.

Issue/Discussion: Draft Administrator's Memo re W-2 Eligibility (Jennifer Noyes)

Mr. Van Dyke felt the memo was not consistent with manual material; the manual describes a "light touch" for only what's asked for. Ms. Ross added that is included what was "needed". Ms. Ross also suggested the wording be changed from "may" to "must" if DES really intends agencies to provide a broader range of "light touch" activities; note that the recent Operations Memo (00-34) about CMC uses "may".

Joe Stafford said that, overtime, DES has gotten a better grasp of what we mean by "light touch" and that this draft Administrator's Memo shows that sort of natural maturation of the program. Ms. Cook agreed, saying it is a better reflection of reality. Administrator Noyes said it is not an attempt to reduce discretion in the local agency in working with the participant.

DES will review the W-2 Manual to determine if examples or other material could be added to better clarify "light touch".

Issue/Discussion: Best Practices

Mary Ann Cook gave her impressions on a recent Hispanic job fair, particularly dealing with quality of Social Security Numbers.

Issue/Discussion: Monthly CARES Update Report, Chris Williams, DES/BWSP/CARES Section

Issue/Discussion: Monthly Training Update Report, Gerry Mayhew, DES/BFS/Training Section

Issue/Discussion: OTHER –

5-Year TANF Limit

There was discussion about the impact of the 5 year time limit on TANF eligibility. Agreement was for a small subgroup to be formed. Because of the high number of participants with multiple, severe disabilities already seen in 24 month extensions, the linking with the Division of Vocational Rehabilitation (DVR) was suggested. Jan Van Vleck noted that plans still call for 8 position in DVR to work exclusively with W-2 participants; the approval for transferring funds is still required from Joint Finance.

Administrator Noyes affirmed that local agency input was needed. Ms. Cook supported this, as did other members. Although the detail made already in 24 month extension cases is useful, there is a need to make additional observations about what is reality at the local level.

Rungs on the Ladder

As part of the 5-Year discussion, Mr. Krivsky, Ms. Hughs, and Mr. Van Dyke said that there still needs to be serious consideration given to creating another rung on the W-2 ladder. Ms. Noyes responded that it is really an issue of what can be done; we need to explore the entire program and what the population with severe barriers means for the program. This is not just a 60 month issue, but will surely be even more serious when participants approach the time limit.

Ms. Noyes solicited members' ideas. A subcommittee was proposed and Ms. Cook "volunteered" to chair; subcommittee members should be identified to Ms. Cook as soon as possible.

Agenda Planning

- Mr. Stepaniak requested additional performance standard information from Paul Saeman and Jude Morse at the next meeting.
- Mr. Van Dyke requested that, at the Income Maintenance Advisory Committee (IMAC) or this group, Food Stamp EBT implementation be discussed; the primary concern is with the contractor's telephone support. It lacks sophistication and personal contact. Members felt IMAC was a more appropriate forum for this issue.

NEXT MEETING DATE:

**July 21, 2000
201 East Washington Ave.
Madison, WI 53707**

**10:00 a.m. – 2:00 p.m.
GEF 1, Room 400X**